DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 510 JC 880 145

TITLE Legislative Priorities of the Commission, 1988. Commission Report 88-2.
INSTITUTION California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Feb 88
NOTE 10p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Allied Health Occupations Education; *Community Colleges; *Educational Legislation; Educational Research; Fees; Governance; Postsecondary Education; *Private Colleges; State Aid; State Boards of Education; State Colleges; *State Legislation; State Universities; *Student Financial Aid
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

An outline is provided, for its staff, of the seven priorities of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), during the second half of the California State Legislature's 1987-88 session. The report states that the Commission's staff will: (1) work with legislators and the Governor's staff to develop and implement appropriate statutory revisions to resolve existing problems in community college governance and finance; (2) identify appropriate legislative proposals to simplify and expand student financial aid; (3) seek to develop a consensus recommendation to ensure equitable and predictable student fees in anticipation of the sunset of current law; (4) promote the establishment of a task force to reassess the purposes of evaluating health manpower and health sciences educational planning in California; (5) create a State Council for Research and Technological Development; (6) monitor the compliance of accredited independent and private institutions with the standards of the commission; and (7) continue the California Student Opportunity and Access Program. A selected list of 17 recent CPEC reports is appended. (UCM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED292510

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES OF THE COMMISSION, 1988

A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Testa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

JC 880 145

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This statement outlines the Commission's seven priorities for legislative liaison by its staff during the second half of the Legislature's 1987-88 session:

1. Reforming Community Colleges: Commission staff will work with the authors of Assembly Bill 1725 and other legislators and the Governor's staff to develop and implement appropriate statutory revisions to resolve existing problems.

2. Simplifying and expanding student financial aid: Staff will identify appropriate legislative proposals for possible consideration in 1988 and present specific information to the Commission's Administration and Liaison Committee in March 1988 if proposals are to be introduced.

3. Ensuring equitable and predictable student fees: Staff will facilitate the work of the Student Fee Policy Committee and seek to develop a consensus recommendation on legislation in anticipation of the sunset of current law.

4. Reevaluating health sciences education planning: Staff will seek implementation of the Commission's December 1986 recommendation that the Legislature and Governor establish a task force chaired by the Commission with representatives from the public and independent colleges and universities and the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development in order to reassess the purposes of evaluating health manpower and health sciences educational planning in California with the intention of updating existing legislation.

5. Setting priorities for State-funded research at the University of California: Staff will seek to implement the Commission's proposal for creating a State Council for Research and Technological Development.

6. Monitoring accredited independent and private institutions: Staff will seek implementation of proposals by the Commission and the Student Aid Commission that existing statutes be revised to allow the State to guarantee compliance of accredited independent and private institutions with its minimum standards.

7. Continuing the California Student Opportunity and Access Program (Cal-SOAP): Staff will seek removal of Cal-SOAP's sunset date and "pilot" status from statute.

The Commission adopted this document at its meeting on February 8, 1988, on recommendation of its Administration and Liaison Committee. Additional copies may be obtained from the Library of the Commission at (916) 322-8031. Further information about the statement may be obtained from Bruce D. Hamlett, the Commission's Director of Legislative Affairs and Budget Analysis at (916) 322-8010.

COMMISSION REPORT 88-2
PUBLISHED FEBRUARY 1988

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 88-2 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

Reforming Community Colleges 1

Simplifying and Expanding Student Financial Aid 2

Ensuring Equitable and Predictable Student Fees 2

Reevaluating Health Sciences Education Planning 2

Setting Priorities for State-Funded Research at the University of California 3

Monitoring Accredited Independent and Private Institutions 3

Continuing the California Student Opportunity and Access Program (Cal-SOAP) 4

References 4

Legislative Priorities of the Commission, 1988

BASED on its current policies and past recommendations, the California Postsecondary Education Commission is planning a number of legislative initiatives during the second half of the 1987-88 legislative session. Among its highest priorities are the following seven:

1. Reforming Community Colleges

The issue: **California's Community Colleges face several major problems that require legislative action. These problems include:**

1. ***Inadequate accountability and decision making:*** **The Community Colleges are not a "system" in the usual meaning of that term in higher education. Authority is dispersed among the Legislature, local boards, and the Board of Governors, rendering the Board relatively ineffectual in providing systemwide leadership and maintaining systemwide accountability. The Board has lacked the authority for comprehensive planning, effective administration of a wide range of statewide programs, and development of an adequate data base for governance.**

2. ***Inappropriate financing structure:*** **Community College districts are now almost totally dependent upon the State for fiscal support, yet the system for allocating State resources to them is based on a rigid statutory enrollment-driven financing mechanism that is annually adjusted by factors that do not relate directly to the revenue needs of the districts and is not sufficiently sensitive to their mission and function in serving the changing populations in California's communities. As a result, the management and finances of many Community College districts are often in disarray, and accountability is not clear.**

3. ***Overreliance on part-time faculty:*** **Because of financial instabilities and local policies, many Community Colleges lack a sufficient core of full-time faculty in key academic areas. In many cases, a better balance between full-time and part-time faculty based on sound educational policies is necessary in order to improve the quality and long-term effectiveness of the academic program.**

4. ***Need for revised faculty selection, review, and improvement:*** **The current system for selecting, certificating, and reviewing Community College faculty is more similar to that of the public schools than of colleges and universities. As a consequence, limited emphasis is given to peer review, faculty professional development, and faculty participation in governance. Further, Community College faculty and administrators are not as diverse by ethnicity and sex as are the students and communities they serve.**

5. ***Lack of clarity in State priorities:*** **Community Colleges offer instruction at 106 campuses and many off-campus sites for a variety of purposes, including transfer, vocational, remedial, and community service education. Much of this instruction is State supported, but the State has lacked a clear statement of priorities among the range of education and services offered. Concerns have been expressed about the declining transfer rate, the need for vocational programs to be relevant and responsive to the dramatic changes in California's economy, the growing need for remedial education throughout the State, and the capacity of postsecondary institutions to provide sufficient courses in English as a second language for non-English speaking California citizens.**

Recommendation: Commission staff will work with the authors of Assembly Bill 1725 and other legislators and the Governor's staff to develop and implement appropriate statutory revisions to resolve these problems.

2. Simplifying and expanding student financial aid

The issue: Previous Commission work on the issue of student financial assistance has identified two important problems:

1. The technical complexity of the application process for both State and federal financial aid makes real access to financial aid for many students problematic; and
2. The increased cost of tuition and fees for education coupled with inadequate increases for grant assistance is forcing more students and families to loans to pay the costs of attendance.

To resolve both problems, the Commission has taken the policy position of recommending expanded early outreach and public information efforts to students about how to apply for aid and prepare for the costs of higher education as well as supporting models for alternative tuition prepayment plans for postsecondary education. However, as the Postsecondary Education and Student Aid Commissions have evaluated various alternative prepayment plans, they have found them to have weaknesses:

1. Redundancy of savings options available through the private sector;
2. Restriction of student choice of which institution to attend; and
3. The favoring of middle- and upper-income students through indirect State subsidy over low-income students who need grant assistance.

Recommendation: To respond to these problems, Commission staff has begun preliminary discussions to identify appropriate legislative proposals for possible consideration in 1988. Specific information will be presented to the Commission's Administration and Liaison Committee in March, if proposals are to be introduced.

---

3. Ensuring equitable and predictable student fees

The issue: Current state student fee policy was enacted in 1985, through the passage of Senate Bill 195 (Maddy, Chapter 1523, Statutes of 1985). The policy is to keep fees as low as possible, the State shall bear primary responsibility for the cost of providing postsecondary education, students shall be responsible for a portion of the total cost of their education, and any necessary increases in mandatory systemwide student fees shall be gradual, moderate, predictable, and equitably borne by all students in each segment. The policy specifically provides that student fees shall be fixed at least 10 months prior to the fall term in which they become effective; annual fee increases or decreases are permitted up to 10 percent, in the event that State revenues and expenditures are substantially unbalanced due to unforeseen factors; and mandatory systemwide student fees for graduate students shall not differ from those charged undergraduate students. The policy was a consensus proposal developed by an intersegmental Student Fee Policy Committee, chaired by Commission staff. This current statewide student fee policy is scheduled to sunset on August 31, 1990.

At the request of student organizations and the systemwide offices of the segments, Commission staff has reconvened the Student Fee Policy Committee to develop legislative proposals to replace or extend the existing policy.

Recommendation: Commission staff will facilitate the work of the Student Fee Policy Committee and seek to develop a consensus recommendation on legislation in anticipation of the sunset of current law.

---

4. Reevaluating health sciences education planning

The issue: The Commission is directed by *Education Code* Sections 22712.5-22712.7 to report biennially on (1) whether enrollments in the health sciences education are adequate to meet California's needs for health personnel, (2) whether health sciences training programs make maximum use of clinical and classroom resources throughout the State, and (3) whether new health science programs should be established or existing programs eliminated. Thus far the Commission has published four reports in response to this directive with the most recent, *Health Sciences in California, 1985-86*, in December 1986.

The lack of data about the current availability and future demand for health practitioners in California has restricted the ability of the Commission to provide the needed policy analysis and advice. Moreover, in the decade since the enabling legislation (AB 1748, Duffy; Chapter 600, Statutes of 1976) was enacted, major changes have occurred in federal and State policies regarding health care delivery and health sciences education. The Commission concluded that "it is time to re-evaluate health manpower demands and educational planning to meet those demands," especially because "current statutes on health sciences education planning are based almost exclusively on economic assumptions concerning health care practitioners."

Recommendation: Staff will seek implementation of the Commission's December 1986 recommendation that the Legislature and Governor establish a task force chaired by the Commission with representatives from the public and independent colleges and universities and the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development in order to reassess the purposes of evaluating health manpower and health sciences educational planning in California with the intention of updating existing legislation.

---

5. Setting priorities for State-funded research at the University of California

The issue: Supplemental Language to the 1985 Budget Act directed the Commission to report on the "program and fiscal impact of the continued growth of extramurally funded research at the University of California" and to recommended appropriate State policy. In responding to this directive, the Commission published *Issues Related to Funding of Research at the University of California* in February 1987, in which it presented the following conclusions:

- Currently, the State appropriates some $185 million a year to support the University's organized research activities, and it subsidizes departmental research by an estimated $100 million -- bringing its support for all research to nearly 30 percent of the University's total research funds.
- Even with research expenditures in 1984-85 averaging $106,835 for every full-time-equivalent faculty member and $18,120 for every graduate student, the University's research funds are still insufficient to subsidize many worthy proposals from individual faculty members and to support Organized Research Units at a level considered necessary by the University.
- The State has no analytical means for evaluating the adequacy of its current level of support for research in the University or of the need for more categorical research." Funding decisions are arrived at either by altering previous commitments in light of inflation or through a political process with priorities established through budget proposals. Moreover, the total amount of the State's spending on research is unknown.

The Commission therefore recommended that the State establish "a Council for Research and Technological Development to assist in identifying State research and development priorities, coordinate efforts in these areas, and advise the Governor and Legislature on appropriate and necessary levels of State funding for research." This council would include independent advisors with special expertise in areas of research and development and be able to provide a comprehensive perspective on research priorities, as well as comprehensive information on State spending for research. The council would also assist in developing partnerships "between academic and business institutions, encouraging increased support for basic research from all sources, proposing State policies to enhance the climate for research, and advising the Governor and Legislature on other matters relating to research and technological development."

Recommendation: Commission staff will seek to implement the Commission's proposal for creating a State Council for Research and Technological Development.

---

6. Monitoring accredited independent and private institutions

The issue: Independent and private degree and nondegree granting institutions are eligible to operate in California as a result of accreditation by an accrediting association recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education. These institutions are not subject

to California State oversight of their academic or vocational programs, and they are assumed to operate in compliance with the minimum education standards and consumer protection provisions required of non-accredited institutions.

This exemption from State oversight for accredited institutions creates an anomaly in public policy. While accrediting associations require that an institution be licensed by the State before it can be accredited, California policy provides that after an institution is accredited, it is thereby automatically licensed, and only in situations when there is "substantial evidence of violation" by the institution of the standards of the responsible accrediting agency can the State approval agency make further investigation. In those situations when its investigation leads to the conclusion that the institution is violating these accrediting standards, the State agency has the option of publicizing the results of the investigation, requesting that the institution improve its operations, or submitting the evidence to the Attorney General for possible court action. However, the State has no authority to deny, suspend, or revoke the license of an accredited institution that is not in compliance with State law, as that authority has been delegated to the accrediting associations.

Both the Postsecondary Education Commission and the Student Aid Commission have recommended that existing law be revised to provide the State with the statutory responsibility to guarantee compliance with minimum standards. In July 1984, in adopting its report, *Public Policy, Accreditation, and State Approval in California*, the Postsecondary Education Commission recommended that "the State should have the authority, after exhausting all administrative procedures necessary to insure the involved institution due process of law, to rescind the license of an accredited institution which is not in compliance with State standards." Earlier this year, the Student Aid Commission recommended in *Student Borrowing in California* that "when substantial evidence demonstrates non-compliance with minimum State standards of institutional quality, the State should have the authority to rescind an accredited institution's license to issue degrees, diplomas, or certificates in California."

Recommendation: Commission staff will seek implementation of proposals by the Commission and the Student Aid Commission that existing statutes be revised to allow the State to guarantee compliance of accredited independent and private institutions with its minimum standards.

---

7. Continuing the California Student Opportunity and Access Program (Cal-SOAP)

The issue: The California Student Opportunity and Access Program (Cal-SOAP) was established in 1978 as a pilot program to improve the flow of information about postsecondary opportunities to low-income and historically underrepresented ethnic minority students and to raise their achievement levels so as to increase the number of high school graduates eligible to pursue postsecondary learning opportunities. Following a favorable evaluation by the Commission in 1983, the program was extended until January 1, 1989, as an ongoing pilot project. The Commission was directed to conduct a final evaluation of the program prior to December 31, 1987, and has issued its conclusions in *Evaluation of the California Student Opportunity and Access Program*, in which it states that the program "has clearly been effective in designing and implementing services that improve and increase access to college for low-income and ethnic minority students in California."

The Commission therefore recommended that "the sunset date clause and the 'pilot' status of Cal-SOAP should be removed from statute." In October, the California Student Aid Commission made a similar recommendation, requesting State support for "expansion of the Cal-SOAP Program to three to five additional areas of the State with substantial low-income and minority populations" (Student Aid Commission, 1987b, p. 18).

Recommendation: Commission staff will seek removal of Cal-SOAP's sunset date and "pilot" status from statute.

References

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Health Sciences in California, 1985-86*. Commission

Report 86-35. Sacramento: The Commission, December 1986.

--. *Issues Related to Funding of Research at the University of California.* Commission Report 87-3. Sacramento: The Commission, February 1987.

--. *Public Policy, Accreditation, and State Approval.* Commission Report 84-28. Sacramento: The Commission, July 1984.

--. *Evaluation of the California Student Opportunity and Access Program.* In press.

California Student Aid Commission. *Student Borrowing in California.* Sacramento: The Commission, 1987a.

--. *Report to the Legislature on the California Student Opportunity and Access Program (Cal-SOAP).* Sacramento: The Commission, 1987b.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

The California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of January 1988, the Commissioners representing the general public are:
Mim Andelson, Los Angeles
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach, Chairperson
Henry Der, San Francisco
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles, Vice Chairperson
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto
Thomas E. Stang, Los Angeles
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; representing the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; representing the Trustees of the California State University

Borgny Baird, Long Beach; representing the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; representing the Chairman of the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Angie Papadakis, Palos Verdes; representing the California State Board of Education

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obisbo; representing California's independent colleges and universities

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other state agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, William H. Pickens, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514; telephone (916) 445-7933.

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES OF THE COMMISSION, 1988

One of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

87-39 The Infrastructure Needs of California Public Higher Education Through the Year 2000: A Presentation by William H. Pickens to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, October 14, 1987 (October 1987)

87-40 Final Approval of San Diego State University's Proposal to Construct a North County Center: A Report to the Governor and Legislature Supplementing the Commission's February 1987 Conditional Approval of the Center (November 1987)

87-41 Strengthening Transfer and Articulation Policies and Practices in California's Colleges and Universities: Progress Since 1985 and Suggestions for the Future (November 1987)

87-42 Faculty Development from a State Perspective: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission in Response to Supplementary Language in the 1986 Budget Act (November 1987)

87-43 Evaluation of the California Student Opportunity and Access Program (Cal-SOAP): A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Bill 800 (Chapter 1199, Statutes of 1983) (December 1987)

87-44 The State's Role in Promoting Quality in Private Postsecondary Education: A Staff Prospectus for the Commission's Review of the Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977, as Amended (December 1987)

87-45 Comments and Recommendations on The Consortium of the California State University: A Report: A Response to Supplemental Language in the 1987 Budget Act Regarding the Closure of the Consortium (December 1987)

87-46 Developments in Community College Finance: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (December 1987)

87-47 Proposed Construction of the Permanent Off-Campus Center of California State University, Hayward, in Concord: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request for Capital Funds from the California State University for a Permanent Off-Campus Center in Contra Costa County (December 1987)

87-48 Articulating Career Education Programs from High School through Community College to the Baccaluareate Degree: A Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Educational Community in Response to Assembly Bill 3639 (Chapter 1138, Statutes of 1986) (December 1987)

87-49 Education Offered via Telecommunications: Trends, Issues, and State-Level Problems in Instructional Technology for Colleges and Universities (December 1987)

87-50 California Postsecondary Education Commission News, Number 3 [The third issue of the Commission's periodic newsletter] (December 1987)

88-1 Preparing for the Twenty-First Century: A Report on Higher Education in California, Requested by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and Written by Clive P. Condren (2/88)

88-2 Legislative Priorities of the Commission, 1988: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (2/88)

88-3 The 1988-89 Governor's Budget: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (2/88)

88-4 Budgeting Faculty Instructional Resources in the University of California: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1987-88 Budget Act (2/88)

88-5 The Appropriations Limit and Education: Report of the Executive Director to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, February 8, 1988 (2/88)

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges MAY 12 1988